DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 991 JC 020 055

TITLE	San Antonio College Academic Program Review. Revised 2001.
INSTITUTION	San Antonio Coll., TX.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.accd.edu/sac/instplan/ProgramReview/AcademicProgramReview.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Curriculum Design; *Educational Assessment; Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*San Antonio College TX

ABSTRACT

San Antonio College, a college of the Alamo Community College District, develops a system of academic program review in order to ensure effective and efficient delivery of the instructional services provided at the institution. This document provides guidelines on completing a program review. Through the review, the college aims to produce the following results: (1) provide opportunity for the self-evaluation of the program by the faculty; (2) identify program needs and inform faculty and stage development; (3) establish a procedure for the systematic improvement of programs; (4) assist in curriculum and staff development; (5) ensure quality programs; and (6) suggest means of appropriately allocating the resources of the institution. The review is designed to situate the assessment and evaluation of programs from multiple perspectives. Therefore, it involves multiple levels of faculty and administrators in the process: the departmental committee, the departmental chair, the divisional dean, the college program review committee, the college program review committee, and the executive vice president. Each of these units participates in a different capacity in reviewing the program and developing a final review report. The program review report consists of two parts: the report proper and the supporting documentation. A template of the review report is provided in this document. (GC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 991

SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Mizek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

A College of the Alamo Community College District

Revised, 2001

IC020055

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1
   - 1.1 Key Definitions 1
   - 1.2 The Purposes of Program Review 2
   - 1.3 The Scope of the Program Review Process 2
   - 1.4 Scheduled Five-Year Program Review Cycle 3
   - 1.5 Basic Assumptions 4
   - 1.6 Annual Program Review Time Line 4

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS 6
   - 2.1 An Overview 6
   - 2.2 The Departmental Committee 7
   - 2.3 The Role of the Department Chair 8
   - 2.4 The Role of the Divisional Dean 8
   - 2.5 The Role of the Executive Vice President 9
   - 2.6 The Role of the College Program Review Committee 10
   - 2.7 The Composition of the College Program Review Committee 10
   - 2.8 Role of the IESC 11
   - 2.9 The Assessment Forms 11
   - 2.10 Recommendations on Program Status 12
   - 2.11 The Role of the College President 12

3. THE DEPARTMENTAL REPORT 12
   - 3.1 Nature and Format of the Report 12
   - 3.2 Content of the Report 14
   - 3.21 Departmental Objectives 14
   - 3.22 Core Elements 14
   - 3.23 Department Specific Measures 14
   - 3.24 Need 14
   - 3.25 Curriculum Quality 14
   - 3.3 Supporting Documentation 15

4. DIVISION IDENTIFIED CORE MEASURES 15

5. REPORT TEMPLATES [SAMPLES] 20

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to ensure effective and efficient delivery of the instructional services provided at San Antonio College, it is imperative that a system of continuous review and refinement of its academic programs be in place. As an integral part of the college's overall planning and resource allocation process, Program Review brings into focus those instructional programs that provide high levels of service and provide the community with a wide range of educational opportunities. As such, it is important that qualitative and quantitative elements of these instructional programs be examined.

The foundation of the review process is the assessment and refinement of instructional services that have value to the students. The Program Review process assists in determining the continuing validity of various academic programs in relation to the educational mission of the college and is directly linked to the Mission Statement of San Antonio College:

Mission Statement

San Antonio College -- Responsive Education Through Excellence, Accessibility, and Diversity.

San Antonio College is a public community college which provides for and supports the educational and lifelong learning needs of a multi-cultural community. As a leader in education, San Antonio College is committed to excellence in helping students reach their full potential by developing their academic competencies, critical thinking skills, communication proficiency, civic responsibility, and global awareness.

1.1 KEY DEFINITIONS

The following key definitions apply in the program review process.

a. COURSE refers to a unit of study which covers a set of learning objectives related to specified changes in behavior or learning outcomes.

b. PROGRAM refers to any recognized area of instruction or sequence of courses.

c. DEPARTMENT (or instructional unit) refers to an entity offering one or more courses or programs which lead to a specified educational outcome. Successful completion of a prescribed sequence of courses leads to a degree or certificate.

d. PROGRAM REVIEW refers to a planned, coordinated analysis of instructional programs for the purposes of curriculum review, improved academic standards, identification of resource needs, and assistance in faculty and staff development.

e. IESC refers to the Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee.

1.2 THE PURPOSES OF PROGRAM REVIEW

A careful and detailed program review should provide instructional departments with the following benefits:

a. Provide opportunity for the self-evaluation of the program by the faculty.

b. Identify program needs and the basis for determining those needs.

c. Establish a procedure for the systematic improvement of programs.

d. Assist in curriculum and staff development.

e. Ensure quality programs.

f. Suggest means of appropriately allocating the resources of the institution.

1.3 THE SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The scope of the program review process in the instructional areas is inclusive of the following programs:

a. Technical programs of up to two years in length leading to a certificate or associate's degree.

b. Freshman and sophomore courses in the arts and sciences.

c. Continuing education programs for occupational entry or upgrading.

d. Administrative support services, both academic and non-academic.

1.4 SCHEDULED FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE

All departments within the college must complete a program review cycle every five years. In the fifth year the department completes a summary document for review and recommendations by the College Program Review Committee.

This schedule will be followed in reviewing the departments:

2000-01

1. Foreign Languages
2. Allied Health Technologies
3. Music and Humanities
4. History
5. Management
6. Child Development
7. Special Projects

2001-02

1. Psychology
2. Theatre and Communication
3. Computer Information Systems Technologies
4. Philosophy
5. Biological Sciences
6. Government
7. Academic Development

2002-03

1. Journalism/Photography
2. Nursing
3. Physics, Engineering, and Architecture
4. Chemistry, Earth Sciences, and Astronomy
5. Learning Resource Center
6. Radio -Television - Film

2003-04

1. English
2. Engineering Technologies
3. Reading and Education
4. Continuing Education
5. Protective Services

6. Interpreter Training Program

2004-05

1. Visual Arts and Technology
2. Sociology
3. Economics
4. Business Administration
5. Mathematics and Computer Science
6. Kinesiology, Physical Education, and Health Education

1.5 BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

a. The key or core measures to be evaluated are pre-specified and are to be used consistently for all programs/departments being reviewed. OTE and Arts and Sciences key measures may vary from each other but will be consistent within the division.

b. The Departmental Program Review Committee will negotiate with the appropriate Dean for approval of additional measures.

c. No single measure in the review process shall be used to make a decision concerning the department.

d. Data will be collected and reviewed by the Departmental Program Review Committee throughout the five-year cycle.

e. The findings of the program review report, as well as pre-approved additional measures, will serve as the basis for the College Program Review Committee's recommendation on status.

f. The Chair of the department being reviewed shall be present at the open hearing conducted by the College Program Review Committee.

g. The Final Assessment status may be appealed.

1.6 PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT TIME LINE

The following time line identifies the dates when various stages of the program review process should be completed at the end of the five-year cycle. In the event that one of these dates falls on a weekend, the completion deadline will be the first working day following the set date.

DEADLINE DATE		ACTION
September 15	1.	The Divisional Dean will notify the departments that are scheduled for Summary Review. The College Program Review Committee will forward one Hard Copy and one Disk Copy of the Program Review Document to the departments undergoing summary review.
October 1	2.	The Department Chair will transmit the document to the Departmental Program Review Committee and initiate a request for the computer- generated data necessary to respond to the core measures.
October 15	3.	The Executive Vice President, Dean and Departmental Committee negotiate approval of any additional measures.
October 22	4.	Departmental Committee may request any additional data through the Dean.
February 1	5.	The Departmental Committee submits its completed summary report to the Department Chair.
February 7	6.	The Department Chair reviews the summary report, attaches a chair's evaluation, and forwards one copy of the entire report and supporting documentation to the Dean, one copy to the Executive Vice President and sufficient copies for each member of the Program Review Committee to the Chairperson of the committee.
February 14	7.	The Dean reviews the report, attaches an assessment form, and forwards the feedback form to the Executive Vice President, College Program Review Committee, and the Departmental Committee.
February 21	8.	The Executive Vice President reviews the report, attaches an assessment form, and forwards the feedback form to the College Program Review Committee and the Departmental Committee.
April 21	9.	The College Program Review Committee reviews the report and attaches its assessment form, providing feedback to the Departmental Committee. The College Program Review Committee then conducts an open hearing, and completes the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form

May 7	10.	The Executive Vice President reviews the report, modifies or approves the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form, provides recommendations and feedback to the lower levels, confers with the Chairs of all programs, and communicates the results of the Program Review to the President.
May 31	11.	The Department Chair will submit an implementation plan to the Dean. The Dean will monitor implementation of the recommendations and report accomplishment annually to the College Program Review Committee.

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

2.1 AN OVERVIEW

Since the review of a program is designed to force its assessment and evaluation from many perspectives, the process necessarily involves different levels. The following overview presents the key steps in the procedure.

Level One	DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE	Prepares the summary document
Level Two	DEPARTMENT CHAIR	Reviews the summary report and adds the Chair's Evaluation to the report (includes signature)
Level Three	DIVISIONAL DEAN	Reviews the report and adds the assessment form
Level Four	EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT	Reviews the report and adds the assessment form
Level Five	COLLEGE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE	Reviews the report and adds the assessment form

Level Six	COLLEGE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE	Prepares the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form and conducts an open hearing with the Department Chair and the Departmental Committee
Level Seven	EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT	Reviews report, modifies or approves the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form, and submits the results to the President

2.2 THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

As the first level, the Departmental Program Review Committee provides an opportunity for the faculty to engage in the self-evaluation of their own program. They can, accordingly, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and suggest pragmatic solutions to any specific problems.

The Department Chair will establish a standing Departmental Program Review Committee by selecting members from the department to serve on the Committee. Normally the Committee shall consist of five members, excluding the Department Chair. In cases where there are fewer than five faculty members in a department, appointees may be from similar disciplines. In cases of extremely large departments, the Department Chair may increase the size of the Departmental Committee. The Department Chair shall serve as an "ex officio" member of the Committee.

The functions of the Departmental Committee are:

a. On an ongoing basis, but at least once each year of the five-year cycle, to gather and analyze data relative to the core measures and department specific measures.

b. To identify problems relative to the core measures and department specific measures and develop objectives and action plans for the problems.

c. To provide oversight on improvement efforts.

d. To prepare sufficient copies of the Department Program Review Summary Report, including supporting documentation, to be delivered to the Department Chair.

2.3 THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

While serving as a working "ex officio" member of the Departmental Committee, the chair's primary functions in the program review process include:

a. Acting as a resource person for the Departmental Committee.

b. Monitoring the Program Review Process throughout the cycle.

c. Approving the recommended objectives and action plans developed by the Departmental Committee.

d. Articulating to the Dean those action plans requiring participation by the Dean.

e. Monitoring and facilitating the carrying out of the approved action plans.

f. Reviewing the Program Review Summary Report.

g. Writing and signing a one page summary for the summary report.

h. Forwarding one copy of the entire report to the divisional Dean, sufficient copies to the College Program Review Committee, and one copy to the Executive Vice President.

i. Acting as the official departmental representative before the College Program Review Committee when it convenes in a hearing.

2.4 THE ROLE OF THE DIVISIONAL DEAN

The Dean reviews a program from the overall perspective of the particular division. The Dean's specific duties include:

a. Monitoring the departments ongoing program review process and assure its ongoing nature.

b. Approving the department specific measures.

c. Assisting, as appropriate, the department in carrying out the approved action plans.

d. Notifying the departments that are scheduled for fifth year summary review.

e. Reviewing the report and all supporting documentation.

f. Preparing an assessment form and attaching it to the report.

g. Sending a copy of the assessment form back to the department.

h. Forwarding a copy of the assessment form to the College Program Review Committee and the Executive Vice President.

2.5 THE ROLE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

The Executive Vice President reviews a program from the perspective of the chief operating officer of the college. The Executive Vice President's specific duties include:

a. Reviewing the entire report, with all supporting documentation and the Dean's assessment.

b. Preparing an assessment form and attaching it to the report.

c. Forwarding the assessment form to the College Program Review Committee and to the Departmental Committee.

d. Reviewing the final document including the final College Program Review Committee assessment.

e. Modifying or approving as submitted the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form.

f. Submitting the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form to the IESC for information.

g. Conferring with the Department Chair of each program under summary review to concur, or not, with the final recommended status of the program.

h. Permitting the Department Chair, if they do not concur, to write a rejoinder.

i. Forwarding the results of the review process to the College President.

2.6 THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The functions of the College Program Review Committee are:

a. To facilitate and monitor the various program review activities.

b. To serve as a resource for the various departmental committees.

c. To ascertain compliance with guidelines and format prior to receiving the finished report. The College Program Review Committee has the authority to refer the report back to Departmental Committee for revision.

d. To review the program review report and all supporting documentation and be certain that assessment forms of all prior levels are attached. The program review process cannot continue without all assessment and recommendation forms.

e. To schedule and conduct an open hearing and arbitrate among possibly conflicting assessments of the Dean, the College Program Review Committee, and the Executive Vice President before reaching a final recommendation on a program's status.

f. To prepare and forward the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form to the Executive Vice President and provide feedback to the Deans and departments.

g. To provide a continuous evaluation of the Program Review process and documentation with the objective of updating and refining it as necessary.

h. To keep the IESC appraised of its activities.

2.7 THE COMPOSITION OF THE COLLEGE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The College Program Review Committee shall consist of thirteen (13) members who serve staggered terms. Its membership will be derived as follows:

1. The Faculty Senate shall appoint six faculty members. Two each will be selected from the Arts and Sciences and the Occupational Technical Education divisions, and two non-instructional faculty.

2. Each divisional Dean shall appoint one member from their area, with the Dean of the Division of Evening, Weekend, and Distance Learning Division appointing an representative of the Adjunct Faculty.

3. The Executive Vice President shall appoint one member at large.

In the eventuality that a member of the Committee is also a member of the department or program undergoing summary review, such a Committee member should refrain from voting on the status of said program but may engage freely in all discussions.

2.8 ROLE OF THE IESC

The IESC oversees the Institutional Effectiveness activities of the college. As such, the IESC monitors the program review process to ensure that it is ongoing. The IESC monitors the work of the Program Review Committee, receives reports from the Program Review Committee, and make recommendations for changes to the program review process as needed.

2.9 THE ASSESSMENT FORMS

Levels three through five in the review process each complete and attach an Assessment and Recommendation Form to the report as it proceeds up the line. These forms are in two parts. The first part, the assessment, includes space for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the program, suggested remedies and other comments. These forms will be included in the appendices of the summary report tabbed "Appendix Y."

The second part, the recommendation concerning status, is a series of check-off blocks. Each program undergoing review will be awarded one of three possible recommendations as to its status. A program may be granted approved, conditional or probationary status. The various types of recommended status are explained in the next section.

The Final Assessment and Recommendation Form approved by the College Executive Vice President differs from the others in that it contains check-off blocks so that the Department Chair of a program may concur, or not, with the final recommendation regarding the status of a program. If the chair does not concur, then he/she may write a Rejoinder (similar to the instrument used in personnel performance evaluations). This form will be included in the appendices of the summary report tabbed "Appendix Z."

2.10 RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROGRAM STATUS

Each program undergoing summary review will be assigned one of following possible

recommendations as to its status:

APPROVED STATUS means there are no serious deficiencies in the program relative to the core elements.

CONDITIONAL STATUS will be assigned when a program is assessed as having one serious deficiency relative to the core elements.

PROBATIONARY STATUS will be assigned when a program is assessed as having two or more serious deficiencies relative to the core elements.

All programs assigned Probationary status will complete a summary review every other year, but not more than three times. If substantial improvement is not noted in its third program review, a program on Probationary status may be recommended for termination at the end of that current year.

2.11 THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

The President reviews a program from the perspective of the chief executive officer of the college. The President's specific responsibilities include:

a. Reviewing the final Program Summary Review document.

b. Consulting with the Executive Vice President regarding the Final Assessment and Recommendation Form.

c. Providing feedback to the College Program Review Committee, Executive Vice President, Deans, and Department Chairs as needed.

3. THE DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

3.1 NATURE AND FORMAT OF THE REPORT

The Program Review Report actually consists of two parts: the report proper and the supporting documentation (Appendices). The supporting documentation may include tables, charts, graphs, summaries, and completed forms containing comprehensive data responding to the core measures and department specific measures described below (see Section 3.22). There is no limit on this section other than that determined by relevance to the core measures and department specific measures.

The report proper must summarize the outstanding accomplishments/ characteristics, provide important data supplied in the Appendices, identify strengths and problems, and suggest possible remedies from the perspective of the program's faculty. This part of the report is limited to 10 pages and must conform to the following format:

Cover Page	(Page i)
Table of Contents	(Page ii)
Major Report Sections	
A. Chairs Evaluation	(Page 1)
B. Background Information	(Page 2)
C. Program Description	(Pages 3-6)
D. Results	(Pages 7-10)
Appendices (documentation)	

The CHAIRS EVALUATION, limited to one page, is an abstract of the report. Highlights of the department's program review process, such as major findings and recommendations, should be presented in a succinct manner. **The Department Chair shall write and sign the evaluation.**

The BACKGROUND INFORMATION section should discuss the origin and historical development, characteristics of the program, faculty and student involvement, and especially the goals and objectives of the program. **This section is limited to one page.**

The PROGRAM DESCRIPTION section should discuss in summarized form the data collected and identified as relevant to the prescribed core and department specific measures. The departmental report should address curriculum review, distance learning, any non-traditional course offerings, and the planned use of technology. **This section is limited to four pages.**

The RESULTS section should present findings in relation to the goals of the program, objectives established during the five years preceding the review, core measures, and department specific measures. Suggestions and recommendations by the faculty should be summarized and substantiated. **This section is limited to four pages.**

The final report should be typed in narrative form and three copies placed in three-ring binders. Additional copies of the report should be prepared and submitted as noted in Section 1.6 of this document.

3.2 CONTENT OF THE REPORT

The focal points of the report are the statement of the program's goals and objectives, and the analysis of the core and departmental measures relative to the program's goals.

3.21 DEPARTMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of each department for inclusion in the background information, will be presented to the Departmental Committee by the Department Chair. They should be developed in collaboration with the educational mission and goals of the college. Care should be exercised in presenting the objectives of the program, since each program is reviewed in relation to its objectives to the prescribed core and department measures.

3.22 CORE MEASURES

The core measures identified by the division dean are the focal issues of the review process and should be evaluated both individually and in relation to the goals and objectives of the program and the evaluation of each measure must be included in the report. Institutional Research and Effectiveness will serve as the central point of contact for all data required for Program Review. The prescribed core measures are listed and described in section 4.

3.23 DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC MEASURES

These measure are consistent with monitoring the department's movement towards achieving a departmental goal or goals. Objectives developed through evaluation of department specific measures are evaluated as a part of the summary review. The list of the department specific measures and appropriate data are to be included with the report.

3.24 NEED

Need for the course offerings of a program serve as an important factor in reviewing a program. Factors to be considered include enrollment trends and other data the department deems appropriate.

3.25 CURRICULUM QUALITY

Curriculum quality factors to be reviewed must include:

(1) Departmental curriculum review process.
(2) A review of individual course syllabi by Department.
(3) Accreditation standards.
(4) Coordinating Board approval (status).

3.3 SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Programs/departments are invited to include any additional information or data which they feel is relevant. All such data should be presented in a succinct and graphic manner. If there are any questions concerning the relevancy of additional information, or the manner in which information can be best presented, contact the divisional Dean or the Chair of the College Program Review Committee.

4. DIVISION DEAN IDENTIFIED CORE MEASURES.

Arts and Sciences Division

Measure	Data Source	Evaluation Cycle
Number of sections offered and enrollment in courses during non-traditional times each fall (1 - 6 p.m., Weekends)	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of sections offered and enrollment in courses during non-traditional times each spring (1 - 6 p.m., Weekends)	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Percentage of Students enrolled in college level courses on the permanent recording date each fall who complete the course.	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Percentage of Students enrolled in developmental/remedial courses on the permanent recording date each fall who complete the course.	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of distance education and Internet sections offered each fall.	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of distance education and Internet sections offered each spring.	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of global awareness activities.	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of activities which promote civic responsibility.	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of full time minority faculty	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of adjunct minority faculty.	Unit Data	Yearly
Average class size in the fall	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly

Average class size in the spring	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of employees who attend at least one activity related to teaching methods, curriculum issues, student needs, application of technology, and increased productivity each year	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of new full time and adjunct faculty involved in a departmental Orientation/mentorship program.	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of unit employees who have achieved appropriate levels of computer utilization appropriate to their tasks	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of faculty who receive training in the utilization of instructional technology	Unit Data	Yearly
Productive Grade Ratein the fall semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Productive Grade Ratein the spring semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of Service Learning activities	Unit Data	Yearly
Adequacy rating of facilities in support of the unit instructional mission [1 - Excellent, 2 - Good, 3 - Fair, 4 - Poor, 5 - N/A]	Unit Data	Yearly
Adequacy rating of equipment in support of the unit instructional mission [1 - Excellent, 2 - Good, 3 - Fair, 4 - Poor, 5 - N/A]	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of contact hours taught by full-time faculty (Fall Semester)	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Percentage of remedial students who pass TASP	Institutional Research	Yearly
Student-Teacher ratios in the fall	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Student-Teacher ratios in the spring	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly

Percentage full time employees who have participated Professional Development Activities	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of student who successfully complete sequential courses	Institutional Research	Yearly
Number of employees involved in community support and outreach activities	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of students who successfully master all cognitive skills identified in general education courses (Optional)	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of students who successfully complete core course competencies (Optional)	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage success rates in college level courses of students who complete developmental courses as compared to those who were not required to enroll in developmental courses	Institutional Research	Yearly

OTE Division

Measure	Data Source	Evaluation Cycle
Percentage of full time minority faculty	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of adjunct minority faculty.	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of students enrolled fall	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB*	Yearly
Number of students enrolled spring	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB	Yearly
Number of students surveyed who rate their advisement as above average or excellent.	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of Course Completers (Fall Semester)	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB	Yearly
Percentage of contact hours taught by full-time faculty (Fall Semester)	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Percentage of students enrolled who are academically disadvantaged	Institutional Research	Yearly
Full time - part time faculty ratio in the fall semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Full time - part time faculty ratio in the spring semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Student-Teacher ratios in the fall semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Student-Teacher ratios in the spring semester	Unit Profile Web Page	Yearly
Number of majors	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB	Yearly
Contact hours taught in the fall semester	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB	Yearly

Contact hours taught in the spring semester	Unit Profile Web Page/THECB	Yearly
Number of senior educational institutions which accept courses and student from program	Unit Data	Yearly
Demand statistics on jobs	TWC, SDR, or OTE Dean	Yearly
Number of employees participating in Professional Development Activities	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of students accepted in competitive programs	Unit Data	Yearly
Technical [SCH] non-completers/non-returners employed or pursuing additional education	THECB Web	Yearly
Licensure pass rate	Unit Data/THECB	Yearly
Placement of program graduates over a 3 year period	Unit Data/THECB	Yearly
Professional program credentials - standards being met	Unit Data	Yearly
Rating of equipment meeting business and industry standards [1 - 100% meeting standards, 2 - 75% meeting standards, 3 - 50% meeting standards, 4 - 25% meeting standards, 5 - 0% meeting standards]	Unit Data	Yearly
Rating of facilities meeting business and industry standards [1 - 100% meeting standards, 2 - 75% meeting standards, 3 - 50% meeting standards, 4 - 25% meeting standards, 5 - 0% meeting standards]	Unit Data	Yearly
Rating of budget adequacy to support the program [1 - adequate, 2 - almost adequate, 3 - it's a struggle, 4 - woefully inadequate, 5 - totally inadequate]	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of linkages and external agreements with schools and universities	Unit Data	Yearly
Number of business and industry partnerships	Unit Data	Yearly
Percentage of employers surveyed who rate students above average or excellent	Unit Data	Yearly

Percentage of students who rate the program above average or excellent	Unit Data	Yearly
Diversity (gender, ethnicity, large and small employers) of advisory committee membership	Unit Data	Yearly
Retention from Fall to Spring	Institutional Research	Yearly
Graduation rate	Institutional Research	Yearly
Peer reviews rating instructors above average or excellent	Unit Data	Yearly

* There is a 2 year lag time for THECB reports - Good to check college data on the Web.

Division of Continuing Education & Workforce Development

Measure	Data Source	Evaluation Cycle
Number of students enrolled		Yearly
Percentage of course completers		Yearly
Percentage of successful completers of sequential courses		Yearly
Productive Grade rate		Yearly
Contact hours taught		Yearly
Course cancellation rate		Yearly
Responsiveness to Job Market		Yearly
Licensor pass rate		Yearly
Number of contact training clients served		Yearly
Contract Client Satisfaction		Yearly
Professional Program Approval - Standards being met		Yearly
Equipment and facilities meeting business and industry standards		Yearly
Employer satisfaction		Yearly
Student satisfaction		Yearly
Number of employees attending professional development activities		Yearly
Number of employees achieving appropriate levels of computer utilization appropriate to their tasks		Yearly
Revenue/Cost Ratio		Yearly

5. REPORT TEMPLATES [SAMPLES]

TABLE OF CONTENTS [SAMPLE]

THE CHAIRPERSON'S SUMMARY 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION 2
- Mission Statement 2
- Goal(s) 2

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 3
- Faculty Loads and the Makeup of the Faculty 3
- Faculty Service 3
- Adjunct Faculty 3
- Curriculum Quality and Review 4
- Distance Learning 4
- Use of Technology 5
- Math Tutoring and Resources Labs 5
- Need 6

RESULTS: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS 7
- Strengths 8
- Weaknesses 9
- Recommendations 10

APPENDICES
- Appendix A - Need/Demand Checklist (Mathematics)
- Appendix B - Need/Demand checklist (Computer Science)
- Appendix C - Curriculum Quality
- Appendix D - Unit Plans
- Appendix E - Faculty Development, Leadership, and Service
- Appendix F - Departmental Committee Assignments
- Appendix G - Enrollment
- Appendix H - Grade Distribution
- Appendix I - Media Coverage of the Department
- Appendix Y - Assessment and Recommendation Forms
- Appendix Z - Final Assessment and Recommendation Form

TO BE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT

CURRICULUM QUALITY

1. The program has specialized accreditation by:

_____(specify agency).

2. A syllabus is available for all courses taught in the program:

Yes_____ No_____

If Yes, does each syllabus contain:

A. Learning Objectives	Yes_____ No_____
B. Course Content	Yes_____ No_____
C. Student Evaluation Methods	Yes_____ No_____

If **NO**, syllabi are missing for the following course numbers

_____

3. Part-time faculty are given a copy of the departmental syllabus for each course which they teach.

Yes_____ No_____

4. Is there a degree or certificate plan for your program?

Yes_____ No_____

If Yes, list the title of the degree or certificate:

_____

1. List how graduates of your program satisfy the Exit Competencies of the college for each certificate or degree awarded.

2. Briefly describe the process by which curriculum revisions are made in your department/program.

TO BE PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT

LABOR MARKET INFORMATION
(Occupational and Technical Programs)

An analysis of the labor market for your discipline. To complete this analysis, the following questions should be answered:

a. What jobs are available to graduates/completers of your programs?

b. How many jobs are available in San Antonio, Bexar County, and the Service Delivery Area?

c. At what salary are graduates/completers of our programs hired?

d. Demand statistics on jobs.

e. List other programs and respective post secondary institutions.

EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
(Occupational and Technical Programs)

OCCUPATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION
SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE
ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY

The following form is to be completed by all occupational/technical programs completing a program review.

Section I. Labor Market Analysis

Identify the Occupational Employment Statistic (OES) code(s) appropriate for your departments.

For each OES code identified provide the number of openings for the current year and the next three years.

Please note: This information is available in the Deans's Office using the San Antonio Labor Market Information System.

Section II. Graduates and Completers

The following information should be completed for each degree or degree option within your department.

Degree or Degree Option:

_____

Year	Classification: Graduate or Completers	Percent Employed in Field	Percent Employed	Percent Average Employed in a Related Field or Seeking Higher Education

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").